

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is herein amended. New claim 16 has been added. No new matter has been entered.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-4, 6-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka, et al.** (JP 09-068605), in view of **Taniguchi, et al.** (USPN 2003/0086030) and **Richard** (US 6,421,104).

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka, et al.** (JP 09-068605), in view of in view of **Moller, et al.** (US 2003/0020399). **Taniguchi, et al.** (USPN 2003/0086030) and **Richard** (US 6,421,104).

Each of the rejections is respectfully traversed.

### **Tanaka, et al.**

Tanaka, et al. indicates in at least figure 1 and paragraphs 6, 7, a lens array sheet having a plurality of pyramid-shaped projections. However, they fail to teach the width “s” between adjacent projections or recesses must be more than 0% and not more than 50% of the length “a”.

In addition, the lens array sheet of Tanaka, et al. is used in transmissive liquid crystal display, and they do not indicate LED or organic electroluminescence as light source.

**Taniguchi, et al.**

Taniguchi, et al. indicates in Figure 8, the width “s” between adjacent projections is more than 0% and not more than 50% of the length “a”. However they fail to teach the width “s” between adjacent recesses must be more than 0% and not more than 50% of the length “a”. And, they also fail to teach a lens array sheet having a plurality of pyramid-shaped projections.

In addition, the lens array sheet of Taniguchi, et al. is used in transmissive liquid crystal display, and they indicate LED as the light source.

**Richard**

Richard discloses the lens array sheet having pyramidal recesses. However, it fails to teach the width “s” between adjacent recesses must be more than 0% and not more than 50% of the length “a”.

In addition, the lens array sheet of Richard is used in reflective liquid crystal display, and it indicates LED as light source and ambient light.

**Moller, et al.**

Moller, et al. disclose in at least Figure 2, an analogous substrate to be used with a display device having an organic electroluminescence element. However, they fail to teach the width “s” between adjacent recesses is more than 0% and not more than 50% of the length “a”.

**Comparing the Invention of this Application with the References**

Richard discloses the lens array sheet having pyramidal recesses. However, the rejection is improper because Richard teaches away. This is because -- unlike the claimed invention where the light transmittance of a backlight is improved by condensing -- Richard uses ambient light received from the front surface rather than from a backlight.

As a result, there is a difference between transmissive liquid crystal and reflective liquid crystal in configuration or function. For example, the intersurfaces of the cavities (recesses) of reflective liquid crystal are reflectively silvered (column 3, line 55-58). The case of transmissive liquid crystal display, the intersurfaces of recesses couldn't be coated to reflect.

As above, the lens array sheet of Tanaka, et al. and Taniguchi, et al. are used in transmissive liquid crystal display. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the structure of Richard and the length-spacing relationship of Taniguchi, et al. into the lens array sheet of Tanaka, et al.

In addition, Taniguchi, et al. does not disclose the features of a width “s” between adjacent recesses. They indicate only a width “s” between adjacent projections and recesses.

Therefore, the technical feature of claim 1 “a width “s” between adjacent recesses is more than 0% and not more than 50% of a length “a” of one side of the bottom surface of the recess” is not disclosed in Tanaka, et al. and Taniguchi, et al.

Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references as proposed by the Examiner for claim 1, the claims 1-4 and 6-15 would not have been obvious over these references. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Tanaka, et al., Taniguchi, et al, and Richard do not disclose the technical feature of claim 16 “said plurality of pyramid-shaped recesses condense a light from an organic electroluminescence material layer of a display device”. And other technical features of claim 16 are same as claim 1. Therefore claim 16 is also in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**


The Claims have been shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicants believe that this paper is responsive to each and every ground of rejection cited in the Office Action dated September 30, 2008, and respectfully request favorable action in this application. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicants’ attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Application No.: 10/524,117  
Art Unit: 2879

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111  
Attorney Docket No.: 052137

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Y. Raheja', is positioned above the printed name.

Robert Y. Raheja  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 59,274  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

RYR/bam